DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 226 465 EA 015 413

TITLE Administrative Evaluation: A Process for Discussion. The Leadership Liaison Task Force Report.
INSTITUTION Pennsylvania School Boards Association, Inc., Harrisburg.
PUB DATE May 82
NOTE 29p.; The Leadership Liaison Committee is composed of the following state organizations: Pennsylvania Association of School Business Officials, Pennsylvania Association of Elementary School Principals, Pennsylvania Association of Secondary School Principals, Pennsylvania Association of School Administrators, and Pennsylvania School Boards Association.
AVAILABLE FROM Publications, Pennsylvania School Boards Association, 412 North Second Street, Harrisburg, PA 17101 ($.50).
PUB TYPE Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Evaluation; Administrators; Compensation (Remuneration); Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation Methods; Guidelines; Job Skills; Models; Occupational Information

ABSTRACT

To assist school boards and administrators, this report offers a framework for developing and implementing an administrative evaluation and compensation plan. The document's initial section summarizes the response to the report's first presentation, notes the availability of about 100 existing district plans in Pennsylvania, suggests wording for demonstrating a board's intent to adopt a plan, and offers several observations. The report's introductory and background sections describe how the task force was formed, list its members, and discuss its objectives and working schedule. The following section outlines an eight-step evaluation cycle for boards to use, including reviewing guidelines, determining the weighting for three main areas of evaluation, developing definitions and standards, writing job descriptions, creating forms, instituting appropriate inservice training, and translating evaluation results into compensation. Six exhibits suggest philosophy and guidelines, list and give examples of administrative and managerial skills, suggest job description methods, note other evaluation models, and discuss compensation guidelines. An appendix presents the results of a questionnaire survey given at the report's first presentation. (RW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED226465

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Nicholas Goble

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ADMINISTRATIVE EVALUATION

A Process For Discussion

The Leadership Liaison Task Force Report
May 1982

EA 015 413

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	3
Background of Task Force Project	5
The Evaluation Cycle	9
Exhibit A — Philosophy/Guidelines	11
Exhibit B — Administrative Managerial Skills	13
Exhibit C — Examples of Admin./Managerial Skills	15
Exhibit D — Job Description Suggestions	17
Exhibit E — Evaluation Models	19
Exhibit F — Compensation Guidelines	21
Appendix A — Questionnaire Results	

Report and Recommendations of The Leadership Liaison Task Force

The first section of the document which constitutes the main portion of this report was drafted by the Task Force between July 1981 and February 1982. In March of 1982 the draft was presented as the subject of an evening seminar in nine locations throughout the state to over 700 school board members and administrators.

After the presentation each person in attendance was asked to spend approximately 10 minutes filling out a rather detailed questionnaire about the document. The results of that questionnaire are contained in Appendix A.

The overall response to the document was so overwhelmingly favorable from all segments of the audience (i.e. principals, superintendents, board members, etc.) that the members of the Task Force, at a meeting held April 2, 1982, concluded that other than the few comments that follow, no major changes to the document were warranted.

The Task Force felt that as a result of the extensive field testing, some response regarding (1) model plans and (2) appropriate language necessary for a board to adopt its intent to institute a plan would be appropriate.

Availability of Existing Plans — The Task Force report was purposely designed to assist school districts in developing their respective evaluation and compensation plans. Many local officials at the seminars were anxious to have access to various programs already in place in some school districts. The Task Force has identified approximately 100 school districts with existing plans. Anyone interested in contacting such districts may contact any of the co-sponsoring associations or any of the Task Force members listed on pp. 5-6 of this report.

How to Demonstrate the Board's Intent to Adopt a Plan — At virtually every one of the seminar locations, several board members, although very enthusiastic about the concept, were uncertain how to formally demonstrate the district's *good faith intent* to adopt an administrative evaluation/compensation plan. The following language is offered as a suggestion of how such an intent can be accomplished.

At a regularly scheduled meeting of the board, a motion could be made with the following suggested language:

"Whereas, the Board of Directors of _____ District has given preliminary consideration to the wisdom of implementing a rational administrative compensation plan predicated on evaluation of the administrator's managerial skills in relation to individual job responsibilities and district goals, I hereby move that the board president appoint a committee to consist of two or more board members, the superintendent and other members of the administration of this district, to develop such an administrative and evaluation/compensation plan. The committee should present its recommendations to the

entire board no later than _____ to enable the board to implement a plan commencing _____."

Miscellaneous Observations — The Task Force committee wishes to thank the hundreds of people who took the time to make written comments on the questionnaire. The vast majority of the written comments were *very favorable* and/or reflected thoughts or points of view that the Task Force itself had debated. Space and time restrictions did not allow all of them to be included in the following document. Yet the Task Force felt that three deserve additional comment.

- The most "negative" response of the "agree/disagree" question was No. 15 (5) in Appendix A, which suggested the district might want *to consider* the advantages/disadvantages of moving salary increases to a salary year other than July 1-June 30. **The Task Force wanted to stress this was merely a suggestion.** Although only 20% disagreed with the suggestion, it caused considerable comment at each seminar location. The point of the suggestion was to avoid granting administrative pay raises in July because it might be construed as a "signal" of where the district might be willing to go in its negotiations with other bargaining unit employes.
- In conjunction with the above, someone suggested splitting the raises, giving part in July, and part in January, for example.
- Regarding the topic of administrative managerial skills, one participant pointed out (and correctly so, the Task Force agreed) that No. 9 on page 13 of the report should read "ability to delegate authority," not "ability to delegate responsibility." The essence of management is accomplishing tasks through others, but the *responsibility* for getting those things done remains with each level of management.

Introduction

The work of the Task Force on Administrative Evaluation needs to be viewed, and discussed, in the context of a total systems approach in solving the problems of specific areas of operation and concern. If this report is to be useful for school directors and administrators as a mechanism for implementing a plan of evaluation, it must have the benefit of a team approach and the unqualified commitment of the team to find ways to make it work.

Therefore, it is imperative that school boards ensure that good operating *policies* exist which will permit administrative evaluation to take place; and school administrators provide the necessary input to the board to allow for good policy decision-making to occur. Above all, the board has the responsibility to keep current and communicate those things for which the board will hold administrators accountable in the evaluation process.

It is with this philosophy that all members of the team can approach the process of developing an evaluation plan with the understanding that from these discussions a new model and spirit of cooperation will emerge for the good of the governance and management of public education.

Background of Task Force Project

During the summer of 1981, the Liaison Committee [representatives of the Pennsylvania Association of School Business Officials (PASBO), Pennsylvania Association of Elementary School Principals (PAESP), Pennsylvania Association of Secondary School Principals (PASSP), Pennsylvania Association of School Administrators (PASA), and Pennsylvania School Boards Association (PSBA)] met at the PSBA Annual Summer Workshop, Bucknell University, to discuss the establishment of a task force to study the development of a model or framework which would enable local school districts to deal with the complex problems of administrative evaluation.

On July 9, 1981, the selection of task force members was completed and the official beginning of the "Leadership Liaison Task Force on Administrative Evaluation" was announced. Representatives of the various organizations selected to participate in this unique assignment included:

PASBO — **Sheldon W. Grasley, Chairman**
Business Manager, Colonial School District
Germantown Pike
Plymouth Meeting, PA 19462
(215) 825-1500

PAESP — **Albert D. Erb,** Principal
Whitemarsh Elementary School
Colonial School District
4120 Joshua Road
Lafayette Hill, PA 19444
(215) 825-1500

PASSP — **Frank Manley,** Principal
Perkiomen Valley SHS
Perkiomen Valley School District
Route 29 and Trappe Road
Graterford, PA 19426
(215) 489-4724

PASA — **Dr. Thomas E. Persing,** Superintendent
Upper Perkiomen School District
201 W. Fifth Street
East Greenville, PA 18041
(215) 679-7961

PSBA — **Dr. Robert F. Eshleman,** PSBA 1982
President and member of the Donegal
Area School Board
P. O. Box 275
Mount Joy, PA
(O) (717) 291-4041
(H) (717) 653-5609

PSBA — **Joseph V. Oravitz**, Executive Director; and
Donald B. Owen, Assistant Director,
Inservice Education
Pennsylvania School Boards Association
412 North Second Street
Harrisburg, PA 17101
(717) 233-1642

A joint suggested **Statement of Objectives** was developed by the Liaison Committee which served as initial guidance for the Task Force. This statement suggested:

> "In general, evaluation should include assessment of administrative performance and clear direction of the Board in establishing goals and measuring progress toward established goals. There is an agreed upon need for objectivity and fairness in the development and application of criteria to be used for evaluation purposes."

During the Bucknell conference meeting, the Liaison Committee searched for ways to implement the suggested Statement of Objectives. After much deliberation, it was agreed that any area of further discussion (by the Task Force) should include: evaluation for improved performance (and objective appraisal of past performance); and evaluation as it may relate to compensation. It was also agreed that evaluation as set forth in the School Code related to rating for disciplinary purposes was *not* the objective of these discussions, and should not be included in the efforts of the Task Force, except that at the end of such a Task Force effort, some modification of current law may be considered desirable.

The charge given to the Task Force was three-fold:

- Develop general guidelines related to evaluation and compensation.
- Develop a structure and criteria that fits the guidelines.
- Identify models that could be used as examples to support the guidelines and structure.

During the next nine months the Task Force met and began the process of reviewing literature and publications on the topic of evaluation in order to determine the state-of-the-art and current thinking on the subject.

Considerable time was spent discussing the importance and future implications attached to the development of the Task Force report. These discussions reviewed the development of the management team concept since the advent of collective bargaining (Act 195 of 1970) and the current treatment of the team concept in various parts of the state. It was agreed that a positive approach to administrative evaluation should be undertaken with the full recognition that some school districts may be experiencing difficulty with the team concept at the present time.

Recognition of the management team concept or philosophy was viewed in the total framework of the responsibility of each school district to establish and adopt goals and the belief that evaluation should be tied to the general framework of system-wide goals.

The Task Force established a working schedule which concentrated on:

- The development of general guidelines which could be used by all school districts as a framework, consistent with each district's adopted goals.
- Identifying criteria relative to these guidelines.
- The identification or formulation of models that can be implemented as workable plans.

Since evaluation and compensation usually tie together at some point in time, references to compensation were considered a natural outgrowth of evaluation guidelines and criteria. However, since the charge of the Task Force centered on administrative evaluation, no attempt was made to reinvent existing published plans (e.g.): School Management Appraisal and Rating Technique (SMART) or similar compensation plans.

The work of the Task Force concentrated on the philosophical and practical implementation of an evaluation/compensation plan, keeping foremost in mind the diversity of districts (size, number of personnel, etc.) which could have an effect on the ultimate outcome of working with the Task Force guidelines. After several meetings, an **Evaluation Cycle** was suggested as being helpful to local districts in approaching this difficult task.

The Evaluation Cycle

The Task Force suggested that once a board has seriously considered the prospect of developing an evaluation/compensation plan, the board should go on record and declare its intent to adopt (or revise) an evaluation/compensation plan, and then proceed as follows:

1. Each district could start by reviewing the suggested eighteen guidelines proposed by the Task Force (Exhibit A). Those guidelines, modified to suit local needs, would become the framework around which the plan would continue.

The Task Force spent considerable time and effort in discussing and debating the general areas deemed applicable for evaluation of administrative personnel. It was agreed that all administrative positions, regardless of title or responsibility, required the effective use of certain administrative/managerial skills regardless of the position held. Evaluation in this skill area was considered extremely important in any evaluation report and the Task Force suggested some 19 skill areas for consideration in developing a local district plan. (AREA I)

A second area of evaluation centered on the specific job responsibility delegated to the position to be evaluated. (AREA II)

A third area of evaluation dealt with individual goals developed within a local district consistent with the pre-established plan of the district. Since some districts rely heavily on Management by Objectives (MBO) or other similar management plans, and others place little or no emphasis on this management style, each district would follow the evaluation style (found in AREA III) consistent with their plans.

2. Each district would then review the applicability and use of the three main areas suggested by the Task Force for evaluation and eventually determine the relative weighting to be assigned to each of those areas, if any.

AREA I	AREA II	AREA III
Administrative/ Managerial skills	Specific job description responsibilities	Individual goals within the framework of district goals

3. Under the general heading of Administrative/Managerial skills (see Exhibit B), the district would consider items on that list and determine which of those 19 skills (thought to be common to all positions) should be included in the evaluation plan. Again, this list could be modified by a local district by deleting, adding or otherwise changing the 19 skills identified by the Task Force.

Since terms have different meanings and interpretations to different people, the Task Force suggested that common agreement

should be achieved to avoid potential pitfalls in the evaluation process.

4. Definitions and standards for each item should be developed for common application and understanding of the use in the evaluation process. (See Exhibit C).

With job responsibility the heart of the evaluation process, the Task Force suggested:

5. Job descriptions should be written considering the guidelines suggested by the Task Force in Exhibit D.

Ultimately the results of any evaluation plan need to be reduced to writing. The form and format to be used in this process becomes critical to the implementation process.

6. A form should be developed which would include evaluation criteria agreed to in each district. The final format — either completely narrative or completely a numerical-based checklist, or a combination thereof — would be communicated to all parties for common agreement as to proper use. As indicated in the comments of Exhibit E, the choice of anywhere from a two to a five-pronged evaluation model, and the words that are used in that model, can be extremely important in the eventual success or lack of success of such a plan.

Before the results of the evaluation plan can be implemented, a thorough understanding by all parties is needed.

7. Appropriate inservice of the evaluation process for both participants and supervisors would take place.

If evaluation results are tied (directly or indirectly) to compensation, the specifics of such an arrangement needs to be clarified.

8. Evaluation results should be translated into compensation in accordance with a plan adopted by the district. Exhibit F identifies basic principles which the Task Force has developed for a school district's consideration in developing such a plan.

Exhibit A

Suggested philosophy and guidelines for a school district to use in establishing an administrative evaluation/ compensation plan.

Philosophy/Guidelines (In priority/sequential order)

1. Evaluation of administrators is necessary to promote professional growth and ensure the attainment of individual and district goals.
2. Administrative evaluation should be a positive process which encourages and provides for continued refinement of administrative skills.
3. Performance evaluation should have a direct relationship to management compensation.
4. The *development* of an administrative evaluation plan should consider the involvement of *all* members of the management team* or their designees.

   *includes school directors, superintendents, principals and other administrative supervisory personnel designated by the District.
5. Evaluation plans should be adopted as Board policy.
6. Evaluation is primarily an administrative function; however, the Board should have adequate access to evaluation results through its Superintendent.
7. Job descriptions should be developed and maintained for all members of the team as a basis for job evaluation.
8. An organizational structure relating position responsibility/ authority should be developed and maintained.
9. Evaluation should be based on individual performance within the organizational structure and specific job description as related to the district goals as adopted by the Board.
10. The direct evaluation of an individual's performance should be made by the immediate superior.
11. The evaluation process should clearly state the standards against which the individual will be measured.
12. The evaluation should include a process for the review of results with the immediate superior and a further opportunity for review through appropriate channels of authority as deemed necessary for review and redress, if necessary.
13. Timelines for initiating and completing the evaluation process should be clearly defined.
14. Administrators responsible for evaluation should have adequate training to complete the evaluation process.
15. No evaluation plan should be implemented until all parties have had sufficient inservice to demonstrate a thorough understanding of the workings of the plan.

16. Evaluation should be an on-going process requiring periodic assessment of an individual's performance based on desired outcomes.
17. Evaluation plans should be simple to administer and should not be time-consuming in actual implementation.
18. The evaluation process should seek improvement of identified deficiences and/or individual needs through structured, well-planned, competent inservice programs.

Exhibit B

Area I — Administrative/Managerial Skills

1. Work attitude
2. Professional judgment
3. Planning ability
4. Leadership skills
5. Professional development
6. Personal integrity
7. Organizational skills
8. Communication skills
9. Ability to delegate responsibility
10. Ability to work with others
11. Use of time
12. Ability to cope with stress
13. Use of resources
14. Ability to adapt to change
15. Ability to resolve conflicts
16. Ability to control job responsibilities
17. Loyalty to the organization
18. Task completion
19. Contribution to total effort

Exhibit C

Examples of how Administrative/Managerial skills could be used in the evaluation process.

Area I — Administrative/Managerial Skills

Example #1: Work attitude

(Possible Definition)* The manner or procedure in which the administrator approaches his/her job responsibilities.

THREE COMPONENT EVALUATION PLAN

☐ evidences exceptionally good feelings and positive thoughts which causes others to act in a similar fashion	☐ conveys good feelings and positive thoughts	☐ conveys ill feelings and negative thoughts

(attach appropriate documentation where needed)

*See guidelines for use of definitions on page 10, item 4 and page 11, item 11.

Example #2: Use of Resources

(Possible Definition) The ability to use financial, human, and physical resources to complete job responsibilities.

THREE COMPONENT EVALUATION PLAN

☐ demonstrates exceptional use of resources which causes others to act in a similar fashion	☐ effectively demonstrates wise use of all resources under his/her control	☐ ineffective use of resources

(attach appropriate documentation where needed)

Example #3: Ability to adapt to change

(Possible Definition) The ability to adjust to new or different circumstances which are necessary to complete job responsibilities.

THREE COMPONENT EVALUATION PLAN

☐ demonstrates exceptional ability to make desired adjustments anc causes others to respond in a similar manner	☐ successfully responds to a variety of changing circumstances and the needs of the job/ organization	☐ unwilling, incapable, and/or resistive to desired changes

(attach appropriate documentation where needed)

Exhibit D

Suggestions for constructing job descriptions

The specifics of each job description should also reflect a part of the evaluation process. Again, the Task Force refrained from suggesting a fixed percentage to this portion of the evaluation process — leaving this to local school districts to decide.

In attempting to define criteria for specific job evaluation, the Task Force suggested several key points in the writing and development of job description.

- Job description should be written in a consistent style and format throughout the district; keeping foremost in mind the evaluation process flowing out of specific job duties.
- Job description should note the position (name and title) of the immediate supervisor for that position.
- Generally speaking, job descriptions should not take more than one page to define the responsibilities/authority assigned to that position.
- Most job descriptions should be written to identify not more than 8-10 main job responsibilities with #10 being " . . . and such other duties as assigned by . . . "
- Job descriptions should be written in order of priority of tasks to be performed (i.e. main responsibility #1).
- Job descriptions should be updated to include changes in assignments when they occur.

AREA II — Specific Job Description Responsibilities

AREA III — Individual Goals

In evaluating job description responsibilities, the Task Force agreed that the review of each job responsibility on any individual's position would typically entail these five questions or criteria: These questions would also be applicable to **Area III — Individual Goals.**

1. Was the task completed?
2. How well was it done?
3. Did it meet the needs of the organization?
4. Did the completion of the specific responsibility effectively utilize human, financial, and/or physical resources?
5. What external and/or system constraints existed which may have affected the completion, noncompletion, or quality of the task performed by the person being evaluated?

The Task Force agreed that some of these questions lend themselves to a simple yes/no model even though a district might adopt for most other purposes in their evaluation scheme a three,

four, or five level criteria. For example, the first question, "Was the task completed?", can be and probably ought to be in most cases simply answered with a yes/no or satisfactorily/unsatisfactorily response. Likewise, the last question which talks about possible external influences might lend itself to a simple yes/no response. However, if the answer were yes, there might be four or five reasons which could be used to mitigate the circumstances.

Exhibit E

Although the Task Force models suggested a three-component evaluation designation, a local district plan could be designed to accommodate a variety of evaluation levels. Some districts may want to implement a two-component plan of satisfactory and unsatisfactory; others may develop as many as five gradations in their evaluation plan. The Task Force did not attempt to suggest a single plan for use by all districts. The following charts suggest four typical ways school districts could rate job performance.

#1 — 2 component plan

satisfactory
unsatisfactory

#2 — 3 component plan

outstanding
acceptable
needs improvement

#3 — 4 component plan

excellent
very good
good
poor

#4 — 5 component plan

exceptional
above average
average
below average
unqualified

The Task Force felt that the choice of which model was used could be very critical in how results were eventually charted. One school district reported a history of being through a three-pronged system of an acceptable, unacceptable, and outstanding, then reducing that to a seemingly simpler fashion of satisfactory or unsatisfactory and finally coming full cycle to five gradations of unacceptable, average, good, very good, and outstanding. Another member of the Task Force suggested that in using a five-pronged approach, simply varying the top rating from the word "excellent" to "very good" resulted in significant differences when those ratings were combined with a numerical "grade point" mechanism. Since evaluation gradations have considerable impact on the instrument language, the Task Force suggested five sets of words for consideration for districts that would adopt a three-component evaluation plan. *

above average	average	below average
excellent	satisfactory	unsatisfactory
outstanding	acceptable	unacceptable
very good	good	poor
high	medium	low

* *Any three-component plan should find most of the persons employed (doing the job they were employed to do) performing at an acceptable level of evaluation. The plan should find relatively few persons performing on an outstanding or unacceptable level.*

Exhibit F

Although the main focus of the Task Force was spent developing the framework for an evaluation plan, there was no escaping the inevitable that evaluation and compensation would come together at some point in time. Recognizing this fact, the Task Force suggested several principles attendant to compensation. Although the listing of principles was not deemed exhaustive, it should serve as future guidance for local development of a compensation policy.

Principles and guidelines to be considered in translating evaluation results into compensation dollars are as follows:

- The development of the evaluation/compensation plan should involve all members of the management team or their designees. The management team, by definition, includes school directors, the superintendent, principals, and other administrative/supervisory personnel designated by the district.
- School boards should adopt an evaluation/compensation policy and budget funds within the framework of that policy.
- School boards should hold the superintendent accountable for the development, implementation, and equitable administration of the evaluation/compensation policy.
- Salary ranges should be established for all positions which recognize the different organizational responsibilities inherent in those positions.
- School boards and administrators should consider the advantages/disadvantages of moving administrative salary increases to a *salary year* other than the traditional July 1/June 30 budget year. (For example, consider using a calendar year — January 1 through December 31 cycle.)
- School boards should establish budgetary considerations consistent with their planned expectations.

APPENDIX A

Middle-Management Task Force Seminar Questionnaire

March 1982

1. POSITION:

48% School Director
13% Superintendent
.3% Solicitor
4% President
6% Business Official
12% Other
.7% Secretary
16% Principal

2. SIZE OF SCHOOL DISTRICT:

25% A) 0 — 1,000 Students
36% B) 1,000 — 3,000 Students
30% C) 3,000 — 5,000 Students
9% D) 5,000 — 10,000 Students
0% E) Over 10,000 Students

3. Overall, I feel the process described in the Task Force Report would be:

48% A) Very helpful in developing an eval/comp. package in *my* school district.
45% B) Somewhat helpful in developing an eval/comp. package in *my* school district.
7% C) Not very helpful in developing an eval/comp. package in *my* school district.

If you chose C, please comment: *Have been working on such a process, vague, subjective, no compensation, we have an excellent model, good working relationship already.*

4. In my school district, we have:

7% A) No written job descriptions for Administrative/Supervisory personnel.

29% B) Some written job descriptions for Administrative/Supervisory personnel.

64% C) Written job descriptions for all such positions.

If you answered B or C, are the job descriptions generally up to date?

Yes 77% No 23%

5. The report suggests 3 areas are important in this process: 1) Managerial skills; 2) Job descriptions; 3) Individual goals. Please check the areas you think are important:

38% A) Managerial skills

33% B) Job descriptions

29% C) Individual goals

0% D) None of the above

___ E) Other (please specify): *Efficiency, district goals, budget considerations — comparable salaries in like districts.*

6. What weight would you assign to these 3 areas?

	Area 1	Area 2	Area 3
Example 1:	30%	50%	20%
Example 2:	20%	30%	50%
Example 3:	50%	30%	20%

Area 1:	Managerial skills:	42%
Area 2:	Job descriptions:	33%
Area 3:	Individual goals:	25%

7. Do administrators in your school district develop individual goals within the framework of a pre-established plan of the district as discussed on page 7?

Yes 64% No 36%

8. The Task Force suggested that "evaluation results should be translated into compensation in accordance with a plan adopted by the district."

44%	A) I strongly agree
52%	B) I agree
3%	C) I disagree
1%	D) I strongly disagree

If you chose C or D, please comment: *Can't afford it, this is merit pay, not sure, depends on goal of the process, the evaluation process is subjective, Avoidance of lip service must be paramount.*

9. The Task Force suggested that "any plan of evaluation/compensation should be given sufficient time for review and assessment results before major changes take place. Districts should consider committing at least 3-5 years in working through implementation and fine tuning efforts related to such a plan."

33%	A) I strongly agree
58%	B) I agree
8%	C) I disagree
1%	D) I strongly disagree

If you chose C or D, please comment: *Can be accomplished in one year, 3-5 years, too long, 2-3 years should suffice, a 3-year limit is sufficient.*

10. The Task Force suggested 18 guidelines to consider in implementing a plan. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with each proposal:

Agree	Disagree	
1. 98%	2%	Evaluation of administrators is necessary to promote professional growth and ensure the attainment of individual and district goals. Administrative evaluation should be a positive process which encourages and provides for continued refinement of administrative skill.
2. 93%	7%	Performance evaluation should have a direct relationship to management compensation.
3.		The *development* of an administrative evaluation plan should consider the involve-

Agree	Disagree	
93%	7%	ment of *all* members of the management team* or their designees. *includes school directors, superintendents, principals, and other administrative/supervisory personnel in both professional and support related positions designated by the District.
4. 94%	6%	Evaluation plans should be adopted as Board policy.
5. 94%	6%	Evaluation is primarily an administrative function; however, the Board should have adequate access to evaluation results through its Superintendent.
6. 98%	2%	Job descriptions should be developed and maintained for all members of the team as a basis for job evaluation.
7. 97%	3%	An organizational structure relating position responsibility/authority should be developed and maintained, (i.e. an organizational chart).
8. 98%	2%	Evaluation should be based on individual performance within the organizational structure and specific job description as related to the district goals as adopted by the Board.
9. 90%	10%	The direct evaluation of an individual's performance should be made by the immediate superior.
10. 99%	1%	The evaluation process should clearly state the standards against which the individual will be measured.
11. 96%	4%	The evaluation should include a process for the review of results with the immediate superior and a further opportunity for review through appropriate channels of authority as deemed appropriate for review and redress, if necessary.
12. 99%	1%	Timeless for initiating and completing the evaluation process should be clearly defined.

Agree	Disagree	
99%	1%	13. Administrators responsible for evaluation should have *adequate training* to complete the evaluation process.
96%	4%	14. No evaluation plan should be implemented until *all parties* have had sufficient inservice to demonstrate a thorough understanding of the workings of the plan, with specific attention given to the needs of the evaluator and evaluatee.
99%	1%	15. Evaluation should be an on-going process requiring periodic assessment of an individual's performance based on desired outcomes.
97%	3%	16. Evaluation plans should be simple to administer and should not be time-consuming in actual implementation.
99%	1%	17. The evaluation process should seek improvement of identified deficiencies and/or individual needs through structured, well-planned, competent inservice programs, or other suitable means.

11. The Task Force suggested 19 Administrative/Managerial skills. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with each proposal:

Agree	Disagree	
		AREA I — Administrative/Managerial Skills
99%	1%	1. Work attitude.
99%	1%	2. Professional judgment
100%	0%	3. Planning ability
99%	1%	4. Leadership skills
99%	1%	5. Professional development
99%	1%	6. Personal integrity
99%	1%	7. Organizational skills
99%	1%	8. Communication skills

Agree	Disagree	
99%	1%	9. Ability to delegate responsibility
99%	1%	10. Ability to work with others
99%	1%	11. Use of time
95%	5%	12. Ability to cope with stress
99%	1%	13. Use of resources
99%	1%	14. Ability to adapt to change
99%	1%	15. Ability to resolve conflicts
98%	2%	16. Ability to control job responsibility
98%	2%	17. Loyalty to the organization
99%	1%	18. Task completion
99%	1%	19. Contribution to total effort of the school district.
		____Other (Please indicate): *too vague, poor evaluation questionnaire, ability to disagree without upsetting others.*

12. The Task Force suggested 6 questions as being appropriate in evaluating job description responsibilities. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with each:

Agree	Disagree	
99%	1%	1. Was the task completed?
98%	2%	2. How well was it done?
97%	3%	3. Did it meet the needs of the organization?
94%	6%	4. Did the completion of the specific responsibility effectively utilize human financial and/or physical resources?
		5. What external and/or system constraints existed which may have affected the completion, non-completion, or quality of the

Agree	Disagree	
97%	3%	task performed by the person being evaluated?
		6. Other:_____

13. The Task Force offered 4 models for rating personnel. Which one do you prefer?

5% A) — 2 component plan
- satisfactory
- unsatisfactory

26% B) — 3 component plan
- outstanding
- acceptable
- needs improvement

21% C) — 4 component plan
- excellent
- very good
- good
- poor

48% D) — 5 component plan
- exceptional
- above average
- average
- below average
- unqualified

14. The Task Force indicated there are 3 generally accepted methods of detailing the evaluation procedure. Which one do you prefer?

10% A) Strictly narrative

2% B) Strictly numerical

88% C) Some combination of both

15. The Task Force suggested 6 Principles and Guidelines to be considered in translating evaluation results into compensation dollars. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with each proposal:

Agree	Disagree	
94%	6%	1. The development of the evaluation/compensation plan should involve all members of the management team or their designees. The management team, by definition, includes school directors, the superintendent, principals, and other administrative/supervisory personnel designated by the district.
		2. School boards should adopt an evaluation/compensation policy and budget

Agree	Disagree	
96%	4%	funds within the framework of that policy.
96%	4%	3. School boards should hold the Superintendent accountable for the development, implementation, and equitable administration of the evaluation/compensation policy.
95%	5%	4. "Salary ranges" should be established for all positions which recognize the different organizational responsibilities inherent in those positions. Ranges could vary to include minimum — maximum salaries; minimum, no maximum; no minimum, no maximum; or any other system a local district chooses.
80%	20%	5. School boards and administrators should consider the advantages/disadvantages of moving administrative salary increases to a *salary* year other than the traditional July 1/June 30 budget year. (For example, consider using a calendar year — January 1 through December 31 cycle.)
99%	1%	6. School boards should establish budgetary considerations consistent with their planned expectations.

The Leadership Liaison Committee is composed of the following state organizations:

Pennsylvania Association of
School Business Officials

Pennsylvania Association of
Elementary School Principals

Pennsylvania Association of
Secondary School Principals

Pennsylvania Association of
School Administrators

Pennsylvania School Boards Association

This report was adopted by the Leadership Liaison Committee at its meeting of May 7, 1982. In turn each organization, by formal resolution, has gone on record as supporting the principles embodied in the Task Force document.

Copies of the report may be obtained by contacting any of the Associations listed above.

Published by:
The Pennsylvania School Boards Association
412 North Second Street, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17101
Telephone: (717) 233-1642